DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 194 SP 026 748

AUTHOR Ogletree, Earl J.
TITLE Teachers' and Administrators' Opinion of Merit Pay.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Problems; Incentives; *Merit Pay; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

A survey sought to determine the opinions of Chicago and Illinois educators on merit pay for teachers. Some questions asked were: (1) Do administrators and teachers favor merit pay? (1) What are their opinions of merit pay? (3) Can merit pay be objectively awarded? (4) What type of merit pay system would be acceptable? (5) On what evaluation criteria should merit pay be based? (6) Who should be the evaluators? and (7) What should be the goal of merit pay evaluation--improvement of instruction or teacher retention? One hundred five questionnaires were returned by 80 teachers and 25 administrators from elementary and secondary schools. The results showed that the majority of teachers rejected the concept of merit pay and different merit pay schemes, while administrators favored merit pay. Quotations are provided of responses to selected questions, and the findings are analyzed in light of previous research on the subject. A brief discussion is presented of the implications of the findings and suggestions are made on alternative ways to improve the schools, e.g., improve working conditions, smaller classes, higher salaries, discipline, parent participation. A summary of responses to the 44 item questionnaire is included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED264194

TEACHERS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' OPINION OF MERIT PAY

Earl J. Ogletree

"A Nation at Risk": The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education recommended that the salaries for the teaching profession should be increased, be professional competitive, market sensitive and performance-based. Salary, promotion, tenured and retention should be based on merit evaluation, not only on experience and education as is the current practice. The Report supported a peer review system in which superior teachers are rewarded and poor teachers are helped to improve or terminate. In May 1983 President Reagan argued that teachers should "...be paid and promoted on the basis of their merit and competence." Although his proposal appealed to voters based on its simplicity, logic and the American values of achievement and work ethic, together with the "A Nation at Risk" and similar reports and the public's dissatisfaction with the nation's public schools, the proposal gained broad political, professional and public support.

There is no common agreed upon definition of merit pay. For the purpose of this study, merit pay is defined as a monetary compensation plan that awards differential wages or salaries to deserving employees--who have similar job descriptions and responsibilities--on basis of verifiable differences in the quality of their work performances. The differences in compensation which may be a one time bonus or permanent salary increase, are based on semi-or annual systematic evaluation of employee performance. Teachers' merit plans can take many forms:

1) multiple salary scales in which only superior teachers attain the highest salary scale,

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Ogletree

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP026 748

2) salary increments based on difference performance evaluations,

3) accelerated salary scale in which superior teachers move up more than one step per year, and

4) the above-base salary scale in which superior top-salary-scaled, experienced teachers exceed maximum salary step by specific amounts.

Today teachers are paid on the basis of a uniform salary schedule, compensated on the basis of experience and number of colleges credits (education) or partially on the basis of merit. Teachers agree that they all do not possess the same competencies and qualities in teaching, but they do recognize the difficulty of defining and evaluating an effective or outstanding teacher, and it is even more difficult to design an instrument that can rate teachers and compare them one to another. It is argued that it is not possible to judge teacher effectiveness on the basis of valid empirical evidence. A pay-for-performance plan is unrealistic in that pay is one-dimensional while human behavior is multi-dimensional. It is also difficult to define precisely what aspects of performance are to be evaluated and what levels are acceptable. An NTE study of 32 school districts in 24 states used a single evaluation scale to evaluate four goals-personnel decision, staff development, school improvement and accountability. Since the goal priorities were different in each school and school district, the expectations were confusing. Single performance evaluations were found to be ambiguous and invalid.

There is a great deal of controversy surrounding merit pay. Although early research on its use in private business and the federal government was glowing, more recent studies have found "that a great many plans do not work out in practice the way they do on paper." They found that

development of objective measure of performance and the maintenance of the necessary recording-keeping system was too difficult, expensive and time consuming to be practical.

It is argued that merit pay breeds destructive competition and creates serious morale problems. In addition it would be difficult to determine whether an evaluation is based on political, personal, ethnic and subjective criteria or objective standards. With the current climate of declining enrollments, demands for accountability and fiscal cutbacks, merit pay is being considered as a legitimate means of reducing staff. "Therefore evaluation systems that are expected to give information about the quality of teaching have become a two-edged sword--meting out rewards for some and providing evidence to support reduction in force for others."

Educational researchers have found little or no evidence that merit pay promotes excellence in teaching. The evidence is still out on a thirty-year merit pay plan in a school district in Lodue, Missouri. Here teachers feel the evaluation system is objective, but data are not yet available as to their satisfaction with the plan.

Evidence indicates the best way to reward superior teachers is to give them autonomy and expanded responsibilities and opportunities to develop professionally. It has been determined that the intrinsic rewards of teaching aremore important than pay or convenient scheduling. Teachers want to become more competent, but they want the impediments of excessive irrelevant paperwork, discipline problems and frequent interruptions removed so they can get on with the job of teaching students. Others believe promotions are the most significant reward in outstanding people rise up the ladder rather than move up in salary at the same grade level. They

argue that decisions for advancement through promotion are made more carefully than merit pay decisions.

The type and method of teacher evaluations are important considerations for merit plans. It was found that administrative devised plans are ineffective and generally rejected by teachers. While employees' participation in the design and administration of an evaluation system leads to greater trust and acceptance, because of the availability of information and the control over what happens in the implementation of the plan.

Merit pay plans that include both evaluation of instruction for teaching improvement and accountability, with emphasis on the former, have been more acceptable. An example of this is the Peer-Mediated Self-Appraisal (PMSA) System which satisfies the demands of teacher, administrators, and evaluators. It is an extension of preservice and inservice training in which teachers are periodically monitored and "are helped to learn skills that will align their performance with districts standards." Similar to The Lodue, Missouri plan, teachers help develop the rating criteria, evaluation criteria and teachers receive feedback and suggestions for improvement.

The issue of merit pay for teachers is current and critical. There is a need to know what school administrators and teachers think about pay based upon performance in terms of the method and criteria of evaluation, accountability factors, feedback and teacher participation. The data from the study would be of value to administrators, teachers, education, labor and parent organizations and legislatures. It would provide those responsible for developing and implementing a merit pay system with information that may satisfy the needs of both evaluators and evaluatees.

Procedures

The purpose of this study is to determine the opinions of Chicago and Illinois educators of merit pay for teachers. The objectives were:

1) Do administrators and teachers favor merit pay?
2) What are their opinions of merit pay?
3) Can merit pay be objectively awarded?
4) What type of merit pay system would be acceptable?
5) On what evaluation criteria should merit pay be based?
6) Who should be the evaluators?
7) What should be the goal of merit pay evaluation--improvement of instruction or teacher retention?

The data were obtained via a non-normative survey. A 50-item forced-choice and open-ended questionnaire was mailed to 250 Illinois school administrators and teachers. The instrument was pilot tested on ten educators who did not participate in the study. The findings were analyzed in terms of position, experience and level using crosstabs.

One hundred five questionnaires were returned by 80 teachers and 25 administrators; 60 were elementary and 45 percent were secondary school educators, and were equally divided in terms of experience: 15 years (27), 6-10 years (42) and 11...years (36) of experience.

Results

The overall findings indicate that respondents' position had the greatest influence on the responses. In a few instances did level (elementary and secondary school employment) or years of experience impact the results.

Although 58% of the total sample and 67% of teachers rejected merit pay plans, 60% of administrators favored it. Both elementary and secondary

educators rejected it as well. Neither did experience reverse the unfavorable trend. Their response to "What do you think of merit pay in general?" elicited such concensus opinions as:

It is an incentive.
Only a good idea if the politics can be kept out.
It won't work.
It will include favoritism.
A bad idea.
It stinks. Too subjective.
Creates more problems than it will solve.
I favor it.
Only, if done correctly,
Against it.
It is only a momentary status gain. Afterwhile it will lose its effect.
May help to weed out incompetent teachers.

Opinions of Merit Pay

In addressing the issue of the pros and cons of merit pay, the majority of teachers (50-54%) and administrators (60%) and the total sample (53%), respectively agreed that "merit pay is unfair" and rejected the notion it "rewards the best teachers". As would one expect, however, they disagreed on a number of other issues. Administrators were certain that "merit pay will motivate teachers" (60%), "is an incentive for keeping excellent teachers" (60%), "competition is good in the teaching environment" (80%), and "teachers who do receive merit pay will be motivated to improve to earn merit pay in the future" (60%). Teachers slightly disagreed or were undecided (45% to 33%). When questioned on its effect on morale, 58 percent of teachers and only 20 percent of administrators believed merit pay would not enhance morale. But 60 percent of administrators thought it would. Nor did teachers (50%) feel merit pay based on performance would increase interest in teaching. Administrators were undecided.

On the possible consequences of awarding merit pay, 55 percent of teachers and only 40 percent of administrators believed (and 20% did not) that "teachers who receive merit pay will obtain a certain status and

will receive merit pay in subsequent years." But only 37 percent of teachers and no administrators believed that those "not receiving merit pay will be stigmatized and thus not receive merit pay in subsequent years." Sixty percent of administrators believed non-meritorious teachers would not be stigmatized. Their diverse opinions were supported by whether or not they thought merit pay is a "closed system in which only 10 percent - 15 percent of faculty got rewarded." Fifty percent of teachers stated it was, while 80 percent of administrators disagreed. Also 45 percent of teachers believed merit pay would be used to retain young teachers who have greater mobility than older teachers, whereas 60 percent of administrators did not. Neither teachers nor administrators knew whether "merit pay was cost effective." Nor did teachers (58%) and administrators who were ambivalent (40% yes and 40% no) believe merit pay would improve instruction.

The sample's response to "merit pay as an instrument for improvement" elicited the following answers:

Would not improve instructions.
OK! If designed properly.
It is another administrative gimmick.
Could work.
May attract others to teaching.
It is only a monetary reward.
Good teachers will do a good job regardless of pay and incentives.

To the open-ended question about the use of "merit pay for retention," they answered:

No real difference.
Won't work.
Politics and favoritism will intervene.
In favor of it.
Retention, too restrictive.
Sounds like bribery.
Not acceptable.
Merit pay for retention of excellent staff as long as competition does not override instruction, i.e., put on a show for administrators.

Objectively of Merit Pay

The majority of the sample (67%) did not feel merit pay could be awarded objectively. Administrators (60%) and teachers (70%) concurred, while 40 percent of the former group thought it could. To the question of the evaluation of teachers by administrators both groups were undecided. Also teachers(75%) felt teaching could not be objectively measured, whereas 40 percent of administrators thought it could and could not be measured objectively. Also 46 percent of teachers questioned whether merit pay would be based on performance as compaed to 60 percent of administrators who believed performance would be a criterion for merit pay. On the other hand, teachers and surprisingly administrators (63% and 80% , respectively) agreed the criteria for merit pay could be political and could foster favoritism (59% and 80%, respectively). Although administrative respondents believed their system of teacher evaluation was based on sound criteria and objectivity, nevertheless, they probably realized how easily politics and favoritism could creep into evaluative procedures.

Basis of Merit Pay

There are numerous criteria for awarding merit pay. The respondents were requested to decide on extra duties, student evaluations and external examinations. Teacher (46%) and administrators (60%) basically accepted being "paid (extra) for different kinds or amount of work (undefined)," but rejected (teachers 67% and administrators 80%) "periodic performance on NTE or comparable examinations as a basis of merit pay. Similarly both groups were adamantly against (administrators 100%, teachers 80%) student performance as the criterion for merit pay. Teachers and administrators favored broader criteria rather than single a criterion for evaluation.

In the area of instruction both teachers and administrators favored knowledge of subject area (71% and 80%); lesson preparation (58% and 80%);

relationship with students (45% and 80%); classroom management (58% and 80%); and success with individualized instruction (46% and 40%), respectively.

They also appeared to be somewhat receptive to the non-instructional areas. Surprisingly only 45 percent of teachers but 100 percent of administrators accepted professional growth (coursework and inservice) as the criterion for merit pay. Only 29 percent of teachers and 60 percent of administrators favored colleague relations and contributions to school as a whole by 58 percent and 100 percent of teachers and administrators, respectively.

Nor were other traditional and nontraditional criteria for merit pay acceptable to the respondent. "For teaching in schools where students are unable to establish an achievement track record for merit pay", less than a majority of teachers (21%) and administrators(40%) favored it. "For teaching in inner city schools with difficult to educate students" (50% and 40%), for graduate study (42% and 60%), for good attendance (30% and 40%), and "for teaching in areas where a teacher shortage exists, e.g., math, science, etc." (only 33% and 40%) of teachers and administrators responded, respectively.

To the open-ended questions, "On what evaluative criteria should merit pay be based?" The common responses were:

Oh a variety of criteria.
There is no valid area that is entirely fair.
Input from administrators, colleagues and students.
None.
Pre-posttest student gains in achievement.
Both instructional and non-instructional criteria.
Knowledge of subject area, teaching and public relations with community.
Impossible to establish evaluative criteria.

A majority (51%) favored multiple criteria.

Evaluators

On the question who should evaluate teachers for the purpose of merit pay, the sample favored multiple evaluators over single evaluator assessment. Both teachers and administrators rejected merit pay based on evaluation by administrators (75% and 50%), colleagues (63% and 60%), parent (63% and 40%--yes and no), and student (54% and 100%), respectively. However, sixty-seven percent of teachers and sixty percent of administrators accepted a combination of administrator, colleague and parent evaluation as a basis of merit pay.

Their responses to the open-ended question "Who should evaluate teachers?" showed the most frequent comments to be:

A combination of sources--administrators, colleagues and parents.
Certainly not only principals unless teachers get the privilege of doing same.
Principals and/or supervisors.
Principals and students.

Again the sample felt that evaluation should derive from a number of sources particularly administrators and fellow teachers.

The second open-ended question related to this area was: "How frequently should teachers be evaluated?" The majority (65%) said "once or twice a year." Some stated monthly, others every two or three years and a few continuously. Very few rejected any form of evaluation altogether.

Not only are teachers willing to be evaluated, but they want the process to be reciprocal, i.e., right to evaluate supervisors and principals. Eighty-three percent of teachers desired this privilege, as did, surprisingly, 60 percent of administrators.

Acceptable Merit Pay Plans

The sample appeared to be receptive to merit pay as a concept as long as "teachers helped develop the rating criteria, evaluative criteria

and receive feedback and suggestions for improvement." This idea was embraced by 83 percent of the teachers and 100 percent of the administrators. Also both groups (80%) shared the notion that "teachers more readily accept school improvement if they share in the decision making process." Similarly teachers (75%) and administrators (60%) rejected the proposition that teachers readily accept administrative derived plans. However, if merit pay were instituted, 63 percent of teachers wanted "teacher evaluators (supervisors) to be held accountable in that their reports adhere to the districts established evaluation guidelines."

On the issue of different types of merit pay plans, the majority of the sample rejected multiple salary schedules and varied salary increments (80% to 83%) and accelerated movement up the pay scale (50% to 80%), teachers to administrators, respectively.

Typical responses to the open-ended question "What type of merit pay would you accept?" were:

Want none, would go with union decision.
Beyond performance of duties.
Preferably a bonus at the end of year.
Merit pay based on fair and consistent evaluation.
Don't know of any fair merit pay program. Do you?
None, too subjective.

In general, teachers rejected any form of merit pay.

Alternative to Merit Pay

The respondents placed other aspects of the teaching profession above remuneration and merit pay. For example 59 percent of the teachers and 60 percent of administrators felt "intrinsic rewards were just as or more important than merit pay." But were divided on the question of "promotion being a more significant reward for excellence in teaching than merit pay."

The sample felt an alternative plan to merit pay to enhance the quality of education would be to educate faculty regarding the goals, policies and education standards of the school district. In response to the question "should school districts provide pre-and inservice training for teachers to learn skills compatible with district standards?", 88 percent of the teachers and all of the administrators responded affirmatively. Their response seems to indicate that the central issue is not merit pay but communication between administrators and faculty as to needs and expectations of the school district and the staff. The fact that teachers are continually upgrading their knowledge and skills by enrolling in graduate programs, administrators should take advantage of this trend by providing a series of inservice courses that meet the needs of school district staff development.

When asked to articulate their "solution to increasing standards in education, status of teachers and achievement of students, i.e., make the public schools better institutions of learning:, the sample gave a variety of responses:

Education should be a top priority of legislatures.
Increase in salaries--should be competitive with other professions.
Increase inservice training and administrative-teacher sharing in decision making.
Decentralize administration (Chicago Board of Education).
Greater parent participation and responsibility for their children's education.
Higher standards in the preparation of teachers.
The quality of principals needs improvement. We need educational leaders, not caretakers.
Effective and continuous teacher training.
Reduce size of schools, class sizes and unnecessary paperwork.
Improvement of family life.
Rid the schools of incompetent and uncaring teachers and administrators.
Greater cooperation between parents, administration, faculty and students to protect and increase the instructional integrity of the school and the achievement of the students. Many schools and school districts have lost sight of the purpose of schooling--the education and welfare of the students. There needs to be a change in attitudes and focus.

The sample's response to "If you had a choice, would you select teaching as a profession again? Why?" revealed their commitment to and disappointment with teaching as a career. Sixty-five percent responded affirmatively, 34 percent said no. Those who responded positively typically explained:

> Yes, because despite its problems, I enjoy students and sharing with them.
> I think teaching is a satisfying job. There is pride in helping someone learn.
> Yes, I am a successful teacher I care about children.
> I enjoy teaching. I feel I have something special to offer.
> But we should get a decent salary.
> I still enjoy teaching even though I am an administrator.
> Yes. It is a thankless job. I enjoy it anyway.
> Yes, teaching was my first career choice.

The typical responses of those disenchanted with teaching were:

> No! One is not paid enough for the many tasks one must perform outside of teaching.
> No! Society does not place much importance on the occupation.
> Too many dummies are given teaching certificates to consider it a profession.
> It's a thankless job. No or little support from the school board in terms of providing a pleasant working environment, necessary teaching materials and livable salary.
> I don't think so. I want to teach, not discipline. No support from administration.

Conclusions and Implications

The results basically showed that the majority of teachers rejected the concept of merit pay and different merit pay schemes, while administrators favored merit pay, generally. These findings contradict those of Rist (1983) who reported "a clear majority (63%) of teacher responding (to a national poll) agreed that teachers should be paid according to how well they perform in the classroom." Also teachers in this study appeared to be highly skeptical of compensation based on performance, particularly when the amount of differential awards are small. The sample was well aware

of the misuses, abuses, politics of merit pay and the difficulty of defining and measuring teacher performance. The majority of administrators and teachers (60% and 70%, respectively) did not believe merit pay could be awarded objectively. Also the majority of both groups felt that pay based on merit could be "unfair" and may not reward the best teachers. The respondents appear to realize that the components of effective teaching are difficult to define.

Teachers do not enter the teaching profession for monetary compensation. They enter teaching because of the desire to help others, the intellectual and social stimulation and the idealism inherent in the profession. Goodlad (1983) surveyed more than 1300 teachers and found that the majority entered teaching, first, for the nature of the work itself and, second, for financial security. These priorities were reflected in the teachers' disagreement with and indecisiveness on the influence of merit pay on teacher "motivation", "retention", "competition", and "performance". Goodlad (1983) pointed out that although money was the reason for entering teaching, it gradually became the primary reason for frustrated and disappointed teachers to leave the profession. In the present study 65 percent of the teachers, although somewhat frustrated with their current situation, were happy with their work. Also the idea of competition in teaching did not set well with the teachers who on the whole were probably more conservative and less entreprenurial than other professions and probably school administrators. Sixty to eighty percent of administrators believed merit pay would have a significant effect on the motivation, performance, retention and light up the competitive "spirit" of teachers.

There is little or no evidence that merit pay alone will raise the general level of teaching. Fifty-eight percent of teachers in this study

stated it would not improve instruction. They also felt merit pay would continually go to the outstanding teachers year after year, while their average or below average colleagues become resigned to the idea that merit pay is unattainable. Their majority (50%) response to merit pay as a closed quota system in which 10 to 15 percent are rewarded, and that 46 percent felt merit pay for performance as a single dimension of human behavior illustrated their doubts about the efficacy of merit pay as a method of improving the schools. Fifty-eight percent prophesized teacher morale would be low. Administrators significantly disagreed on these issues.

The teaching and administrative sample questioned the objectivity of merit pay, based on unreliability and potential inequity. Sixty to seventy percent of administrators and teachers, respectively, agreed on the non-objectivity of awarding merit pay, although 40 percent of administrators thought it could be. One of the inherent problems of implementing incentive pay plans is that the outcome is dependent upon the person or persons doing the evaluation. Evaluators in different schools in the same district or even in the same school will have different philosophies, expectations and values, and therefore different standards. Seventy-five percent of teachers stated that teaching could not be objectively measured, while administrators were ambivalent on this point.

Teachers in this study believed evaluations are subjective and political, and patronage is common in the public schools. Merit pay is subject to manipulation. A less than majority of teachers (45%) held that merit pay would be given to younger teachers to retain them in the system, while 60 percent of administrators did not. Both a majority of administrators and teachers

concurred on the potential use of merit pay for political and patronage ends.

Institutional merit pay programs are complicated and difficult to administer. The crux of any merit pay plan rests on the criteria used to identify meritorious teachers. Traditionally the criteria for merit have been personal characteristics, classroom performance and student achievement. Although a teacher's personality, appearance and demeanor are rarely used today, academic credential--degrees, graduate work are. Classroom performance is the most frequently used criterion for merit pay, with student achievement (annual pre-to post gains) second. Non-instructional criteria, included in this study, has been proposed, such as the NTE and teaching subjects in which there is a teacher shortage.

While both teachers and administrators (55% and 72%, respectively) favored instructional criteria for merit pay, 86 percent and surprisingly only 44 percent, respectively, selected non-instructional criteria. However, 58 percent of teachers favored "contribution to school as a whole." The sample may have thought merit pay would be based on both instructional and non-instructional criteria. Only 50 percent of the teachers favored merit pay for teaching in inner city school with difficult to educate students, whereas 60 percent of administrators rejected graduate study as a viable factor for incentive pay. Nor was teacher periodic performance on the NTE favored by either group. (See table of questions.). In general, most teachers favored a variety of evaluative criteria. However, both teachers (80%) and administrators (100%) adamantly refused to consider students' performance on standardized tests as a plausable option.

On the issue of who should be the evaluators, the majority of teachers

and administrators disfavored the use of a single category of evaluators, including administrators, parents, colleagues and students. They were more receptive to a combination of administrative, parental and colleague evaluators. Students were ruled out of the process.

Teachers are already isolated by separate classrooms, grade level, subject matter and little communication with and cooperation among faculty members. Merit pay, which promotes competition, will further exacerbate this isolationism. To enhance the effectiveness of schools there needs to be a sense common purpose, staff independence and cohesiveness which can only be realized through administrative, faculty and parental cooperation. The majority of teachers and administrators appeared to recognize that if a merit pay is to work, teachers must have input into developing the rating and evaluative criteria-- a merit pay program that includes feedback and emphasizes the improvement of instruction. Also both groups concurred that teachers will accept suggestions for school improvement and changes if they share in the decision making process. Sixty-three percent of teachers stated this will insure fairness, equity and accountability in adhering to established criteria and guidelines, particularly for the evaluators of merit pay.

What was apparent in this study was the willingness to cooperate to produce quality schools. The respondents agree (88% to 100%, teachers and administrators) that the schools and children would be better served if the districts' expectations and standards were communicated to them through pre-and inservice training. Improvement in performance can best be achieved by focusing on carefully planned goals and objectives, rather than pitting faculty against faculty and faculty against administrators.

When asked to state how they would improve the schools, the teachers replied: "greater in-school cooperation, parental participation, higher

salaries, high standards in teacher preparation, eliminate incompetent teachers and administrators, and continuous teacher training."

The majority (65%) of teachers and administrators in this study were satisfied with and committed to the teaching profession. They enjoyed their work despite the day-to-day frustrations and problems. Therefore, the findings of this survey "bode well" for public education, but not for the future of merit pay.

Merit pay in education presents many problems; the least of which is to define the characteristics of effective teaching. Research has not been able to do so (White, 1983). Also, whether in business or education, personnel research suggests that employees are more highly motivated where organizational expectation of rewards are tied to the achievement of specific goals and are open to as many employees as can attain the objective. Whereas in the merit pay plan employees compete for a limited number of rewards. Some may never get the reward or merit pay bonus no matter how hard they work. Isolation, anxiety, poor morale, low motivation, selfishness and jealousy may be the result (Thompson and Dalton, 1970).

Although researchers have failed to identify what constitutes effective teaching, they have identified some of the elements that make for an effective school. Little (1981) and Pinkey and Warren (1983) found that constructive change and improvement can most effectively be brought about by a "management-by objective" system in which teachers share common goals and promote collegiality and cooperation which includes administrators and staff as well as teachers.

Merit pay does not seem to foster that which the public, politicians and parents are seeking--effective school reform. Instead of seeking answers in a single-dimensional, simplistic solution such as merit pay, money spent on school reform might best be used to improve working conditions

in the schools, smaller class sizes, safety and discipline, counseling services, parent participation, material and books, tutorial services, smaller schools, etc., then providing minute bonuses for a limited few. Spend the money where it is needed--in the schools and on support services that directly effect the education of the children.

References

A Nation at Risk, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Burke, Brian T. "Merit Pay for Teachers: Round Valley May Have The Answer", Kappan. Vol. 64, No. 4 Dec. 1982. pp.

Goodlad, John I. A place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Kaestle, Carl. "Education Reform and the Swinging Pendulum", Kappan, Vol. 66. No. 6, Feb. 1985.

Little, Judith W. "School Success and Staff Development. The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools." Mimeographed. Boulder Color., Center for Action Research, Jan. 1981.

Pinkey, Steward T. and Smith, Marshall S. "Educational Policy and School Effectiveness." Mimeographed. Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Oct. 1983.

Rist, Marilee C. "Our Nationwide Poll: Most Teachers Endorse the Merit Pay Concept." The American School Board Journal, Vol 9, Sept. 1983, pp. 5-15.

Thompson, Paul H. and Dalton, Gene W. "Performance Appraisal: Manager Reward", Harvard Business Review, Jan.-Feb. 1970, pp. 149-161.

White, Daphne Siev. "Can Merit Pay Work in Education?" American Educator, Winter 1983, pp. 8-11, 41-45.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

		TEACHERS N=80			ADMINISTRATORS N=25		
		YES	NO	DK	YES	NO	DK
1.	Do you favor merit pay?	33	67	0	60	40	0
2.	Merit pay is fair?	33	50	17	40	60	0
3.	Merit pay rewards the best teachers?	38	54	4	40	60	0
4.	Merit pay will motivate teachers?						
5.	Merit pay is an incentive to keep excellent teachers in teaching	38	46	16	60	20	19
6.	Teachers who do not receive merit pay will be motivated to improve to earn merit in the future?	31	42	30	60	20	0
7.	Merit pay attached directly to performance will also increase intrinsic interest in teaching?	29	50	21	40	40	20
8.	Merit pay will enhance teacher morale? behavior?	38	58	4	60	60	20
9.	Merit pay for performance is only one dimension of human behavior?	46	38	8	60	20	20
10.	Merit pay enhances healthy competition between teachers?	58	30	13	40	40	20
11.	Merit pay will create favoritism?	59	25	17	80	0	20
12.	Competition is good in the teaching environment?	37	33	29	80	20	0
13.	Merit pay can be awarded objectively	0	70	28	40	60	0
14.	Administrators are generally objective and fair in evaluating teachers?	41	33	17	40	40	20
15.	Criteria for awarding merit pay will be political?	63	8	20	80	20	0
16.	Teachers who receive merit pay the first year will probably be stigmatized and not receive merit pay in subsequent years?	55	8	38	40	20	40
17.	Teachers who do not receive merit pay the first year will probably be stigmatized and not receive merit pay in subsequent years?	37	17	46	0	60	40
18.	Merit pay plan is a closed system in which only 10%-15% get rewarded?	50	30	20	20	80	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		TEACHERS N=80			ADMINISTRATORS N=25		
		YES	NO	DK	YES	NO	DK
19.	Since young teachers are more mobile, they will more often receive merit pay so they won't leave?	45	33	21	20	60	20
20.	Should teachers be paid more for different kinds or amount of work?	46	21	33	60	20	20
21.	Merit pay will be based on performance?	38	46	17	60	40	0
22.	Merit pay will improve instruction?	25	58	13	40	40	19
23.	Teaching performance or effectiveness can be objective measured?	13	75	8	40	40	19
24.	Teacher performance should be based on students' performance on standardized tests?	8	80	4	0	100	0
25.	Merit pay should be based on teachers' periodic performance on the NTE or similar tests?	13	67	21	20	80	0
26.	Merit pay is cost effective?	33	25	21	40	20	40
27.	Should teacher evaluators be held accountable that their reports adhere to the district's established evaluative criteria?	63	8	13	0	40	20
28.	Merit pay is based on outcomes rather than processes?	33	29	38	20	20	60
29.	Merit pay should be based on administrator evaluation?	13	75	13	20	40	40
30.	Merit pay should be based on colleague evaluation?	17	63	21	20	60	20
31.	Merit pay should be based on parent evaluation?	17	63	8	40	40	20
32.	Merit pay should be based on a combination of administrator, colleague and parent evaluation?	67	21	13	60	20	20
33.	Intrinsic rewards are just as or more important than merit pay?	59	30	8	60	20	20
34.	Promotion is a more significant reward for excellence in teaching than merit pay?	38	38	17	40	40	20
35.	Administration derived plans for school improvement are readily accepted by teachers?	13	75	13	40	60	0
36.	Teachers more readily accept school improvement if teachers shared in decision making?	80	17	3	80	20	0
37.	Students should evaluate teachers for merit pay?	33	54	8	0	100	0
38.	Should teachers evaluate supervisor--principals, etc?	83	8	8	60	0	40
39.	Merit pay would be more acceptable if teachers helped develop the rating criteria, evaluation criteria, and receive feedback and suggestions for improvement?	83	13	2	100	0	0

	TEACHERS N=80			ADMINISTRATORS N=25		
	YES	NO	DK	YES	NO	DK
40. Should school districts provide pre- and inservice training for teachers to learn skills compatible with district standards?	88	8	4	100	0	0
41. Which merit pay plan would you accept? (Check one or more.)						
A) Multiple salary schedule.	17			20		
B) Varying salary increments.	17			20		
C) Accelerated movement up the pay scale	50			20		
D) None of the above.	30			20		
42. Merit pay should be based on the following non-instructional criteria: (Cbeck one or more.)						
A) Professional growth (inservice or coursework).	45			100		
B) Relationship with colleagues.	29			60		
C) Contributions to school as a whole.	58			100		
D) None of the above.	17			0		
43. Merit pay should be based on the following in-class observation criteria: (Check one or more.)						
A) Knowledge of subject matter.	71			80		
B) Lesson preparation.	58			80		
C) Relationship with students	45			80		
D) Classroom management.	58			80		
E) Success with individualized instruction.	46			40		
F) None of the above.	13			20		
44. Should teachers be paid more for the following categories? (Check one or more.)						
A) For teaching in schools where students are unable to establish an achievement track record for sufficient merit pay.	21			40		
B) For teaching in inner city schools with difficult to educate students	50			40		
C) For graduate study	42			60		
D) For good teacher attendance.	30			40		
E) For teaching in areas where there is a teacher shortage--e.g., math, science, computers, etc.	33			40		